

REMARKS

This is in response to the non-final Official Action currently outstanding with regard to the above-identified application.

Claims 1 and 2 were pending in this application at the time of the issuance of the currently outstanding Official Action. By the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have amended Claim 1 and added New Claims 3-5. No Claims have been either canceled or withdrawn. Accordingly, upon the entry of the forgoing Amendment, Claims 1-5 as hereinabove amended will constitute the claims under active prosecution in this application.

The Claims of this application as they will stand upon the entry of the foregoing Amendment are reproduced above showing the changes made and with appropriate status identifiers as required by the Rules.

More specifically, in the currently outstanding Official Action, the Examiner has:

1. Failed to re-acknowledge Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 USC 119 (a) – (d) or (f) or to reconfirm the receipt of the required copies of the priority documents by the United States Patent and Trademark Office – **Applicants note for the record that these matters were previously attended to by the Examiner in the Official Action of 29 June 2005;**
2. Failed to reconfirm that acceptance of the formal drawings filed in this application – **Applicants note for the record that this matter also was attended to by the Examiner in the Official Action of 29 June 2005;**

3. Provided Applicants with Notice of References Cited (Form PTO-892);
4. Rejected Claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (US Patent No. 6,526,506) in view of Shah (US Patent No. 6,041,325).

No further comment regarding items 1-3 above is deemed to be required in these Remarks.

With respect to item 4, the Examiner has indicated at the top of page 7 of the currently outstanding Official Action that: "In addition, this entire limitation cannot reasonably or broadly suggest the administrator is to or must respond (i.e., authenticating-authorizing or rejecting instruction) at all "for final authorization of the authenticating procedure" as claimed." In other words, the Examiner appears to suggest that the Claims are limiting concerning a request for authorization, but are subject to interpretation when it comes to a response to the request for authorization because it is indicated that the LAN administrator can enter an authentication-authorizing or an authentication-rejecting response prior to system time out. This, according to the Examiner means that "...the prior art does (is) not specifically required to read on a response (i.e., an authenticating-authorizing or rejecting instruction) to the request or having an administrator entering via an input means and displayed by the display means. As long as the prior art does not discuss or suggest that the response cannot be entered by a user administrator and displayed by the display means, otherwise the reference(s) incorporated herein reads on the claimed invention."

Applicants respectfully submit that while the Examiner's position **might possibly find arguable** support in the previous claim wording, the currently amended claim wording set forth hereinabove is such that the Examiner's position incorrectly summarizes the present invention. Hence, it will be understood that as now clarified in the claims set forth hereinabove, the true fact is that in the present invention the only manner in which an authentication-authorizing response to a request for authorization by a mobile station can be transmitted to the mobile station from the access point device is for an authentication-authorizing response to the mobile station's request to be input into the input means of the access point device. This is because if no input to the input means is specifically provided constituting an authorization-authorizing response to the authorization request, either an input constituting an authorization-rejecting response is provided to the input means or the input means defaults to the generation of an authentication-rejecting response. Applicants respectfully submit that if the foregoing was not clearly set forth previously, that potential ambiguity has been corrected by the foregoing Amendment.

In particular, the claims of this application as amended above or as presented for the first time in this prosecution clearly and definitively indicate that the present invention contemplates that the input means is a means by which an authentication-authorizing or and authentication-rejecting response to the authentication request of a particular mobile station to the access device can be entered, and further that in the absence of such an input for a preselected time following the receipt of an authentication request by the access point device, the input means by default generates an authentication rejection. Thus, it now is unambiguously claimed that the only way that a mobile station can be authenticated for an association procedure with the network is by the input of an authentication-authorization response into the input means (which also is displayed by the display means and transmitted to the mobile station by the transmission means).

Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing Amendment addresses and overcomes the Examiner's outstanding concerns regarding the breadth of the previous phraseology of the claims of this application (that Applicants believe resulted from a stretching of the previous claim wording beyond its clearly intended scope).

In addition, Applicants have noted that the Examiner admits that the Lewis reference is limited to the LAN administrator establishing criteria kept in a table or memory from which the access point device determines whether or not a particular mobile station should be allowed access to (i.e., to associate with) a network. In other words, while the LAN administrator in the Lewis context may set up the original criteria by which authentication-authorizing decisions are made by the access point device and also is permitted to monitor the historical application of those criteria at various intervals for such adjustment as is deemed to be necessary, Applicants have found nothing in the Lewis reference that teaches, discloses or suggests that an authentication-authorizing response to an authentication request by a mobile station can be responded to affirmatively only in real time by a direct input to an input means of the access point as herein claimed.

In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the art presently cited against the claims of this application can fairly be said to teach, disclose or suggest an access point device that receives and displays authentication requests from mobile stations coming into the area of the LAN, and input means that is the only way that a mobile station's authentication authorizing request can be affirmatively responded to, in combination with a transmitting means whereby real time input to the input means or a default authorization rejection generated internally of the input means are sent back to the requesting mobile station for use in a subsequent association procedure with the network.

The Examiner attempts to overcome the limitations of the Lewis reference in the above regards via the Shah reference. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the Shah reference provides direct interactions between service operators and service subscribers via a service management access point. On this basis, it is the Applicants' understanding that the Examiner suggests that "Shah discloses the service management access point can accept instructions from data entry operators to direct the service management system to provision services on intelligent network. With user-friendly icons, service management system can accept and provision particular service features and generate a report for each data entry operator or for each service used."

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the problem with the Examiner's analysis in the latter regard does not appear to reside in the fact that the Shah network contemplates displays associated with each of the nodes of the network, nor for that matter with his assertions concerning the diverse capabilities of the network in the Shah context once the fixed and mobile nodes thereof have been established. It is Applicants' position that the importance of the present invention arises from its determination as to how a mobile station entering the area of a LAN is to secure permission to establish an association with the LAN in the first instance. Once this association is established, Applicants agree that many and diverse capabilities may be possible. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the Shah reference is insufficient to make up for the deficiencies of the Lewis reference *vis a vis* the present invention has hereinabove explained and more definitively claimed than perhaps was previously the case.

Simply stated, therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention includes authentication request display means that receive and display authentication request information from mobile stations entering the area of the LAN. The Shah network nodes, on the other hand, include displays that can display interactively data being utilized on the established network, but as far as Applicants have been able to determine nothing in the Shah or the Lewis references when taken either alone or in combination with one another teaches, discloses or suggests the authentication request display means of the presently claimed access point.

Similarly, as briefly mentioned above, Applicants believe that Lewis suggests some interaction by a LAN administrator with an access point concerning the criteria that must be satisfied in order for the access point to grant a specific mobile station association status with the network. Lewis does not, however, teach disclose or suggest that the only way that a particular mobile station can attain association with a network in the first instance is to first seek authentication authorization from an access point that can only be granted by a real time input to the access point device subsequent to its receipt of that request. In the latter regard and also as mentioned above, the displays and keyboards associated with the nodes of the network in the Shah disclosure do not presently appear to be germane to the present invention as now claimed.

Finally, while it may be true that Shah discloses interactions among the nodes of a network, the fact is that neither Lewis nor Shah teach, disclose or suggest that as a result of an authentication authorization requesting step a requesting mobile station desiring to become a node on the LAN must receive via a transmission means of an access point device a response to the authentication authorizing request that grants to the requesting mobile station the authority to associate itself with the network based upon instructions inputted or a default response generated subsequent to the request.

In view of the foregoing Amendment as explained by the foregoing Remarks, therefore Applicant respectfully submits that this application now is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the foregoing Amendment, reconsideration and allowance of this Application as hereinabove amended in response to this submission is respectfully requested.

Finally, Applicant believes that additional fees are not required in connection with the consideration of this response to the currently outstanding Official Action. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. **04-1105**, as necessary, for the correct payment of all fees which may be due in connection with the filing and consideration of this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 12, 2008

By: David A. Tucker
David A. Tucker
Reg. No. 27,840
Attorney for Applicant(s)

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
111 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02205
(617) 517-5508